

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,342	07/05/2001	Nagesh S. Kommareddi	194-12047-US	4934
24923	7590 05/26/2004		EXAMINER	
PAUL S MADAN			YOON, TAE H	
	OSSMAN & SRIRAM, PC TA, SUITE 700		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	TX 77057-1130		1714	
			DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			()			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/900,342	KOMMAREDDI ET	AL.			
navioury modern	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Tae H Yoon	1714				
The MAILING DATE of this communical	tion appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 10 May 2004 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is requ final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR	uired to avoid abandonment of this either: (1) a timely filed amendme of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper repent which places the application.	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD	FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date event, however, will the statutory period for reply ex ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST RE 706.07(f).	of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for pire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS	g date of the final rejection. OF THE FINAL REJECTION. S	See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the peri 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	od of extension and the corresponding amou e shortened statutory period for reply original	nt of the fee. The appropriate ext ly set in the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereo						
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be e	entered because:					
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would requ	uire further consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see	ee Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the apprint issues for appeal; and/or	olication in better form for appeal t	by materially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d) they present additional claims without	ut canceling a corresponding numl	ber of finally rejected clair	ms.			
NOTE: see attachment.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the follow	ving rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitted	l in a separate, timely file	d amendment			
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ re application in condition for allowance bed	•	n considered but does NO	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be consideraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		DLELY to issues which we	ere newly			
	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) \boxtimes will not be entered or b) \square will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as	s follows:					
Claim(s) allowed: <u>33-39,45-56 and 61-64</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,13-24 and 29-32						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _	 '					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disapprov	ed by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure	Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
10. Other:		4				
		Toolsoff	7			
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Tae H Yoon Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1714				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Application/Control Number: 09/900,342

Art Unit: 1714

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION

Newly recited limitations found in the specification in claims 17 and 29 after the final rejection raise new issues that would further require search and consideration, and thus the entry of the amendment is denied.

With respect to claim 17, the recitation of the polyethylene oxide having about 100,000 weight average molecular weight only certainly at least require further consideration as well as search.

With respect to claim 29, the recited "in the absence of a carrier" clearly further require search and consideration.

With respect to claims 1-7 obvious over WO/98/16586 and to claims 1-6 anticipated by and obvious over O'Mara et al, the examiner may agree with applicant's drawing of the claimed invention when core and shell are covalently bonded and a gentle grinding method is utilized. However, the instant claim encompasses weak bonding forces such as static force or hydrogen bonding and very severe grinding method, and thus applicant's assertion has little probative value. A shell encapsulated core with weak static force would not yield the asserted continuous partial coating when very severe grinding method is used and applicant failed to show otherwise. Also, the examiner points out that the recited "(without particular materials)" is not a typo, and said particular means "certain" or "special".

With respect to claims 13-24 and 29-32 anticipated by and obvious over

Kommareddi et al (US 6,126,872), applicant's amendment is the indication of the proper

Application/Control Number: 09/900,342

Art Unit: 1714

rejection since applicant would not amend claims when the prior art has no merit. Applicant's assertion is based on the amendment being denied of the entry and thus has no probative value. The utilization of the polyethylene oxide having molecular weight of 100,000 and up to several millions in Kommareddi et al would be an inherent practice because a lower molecular weight polyethylene oxide is sticky at room temperature due to its low melting point. The polyethylene oxide is also a drag reducer by itself, and thus the use of lower molecular weight polyethylene oxide would not be expected. One of the well known commercial chemical vendors, Aldrich Chemical Company, lists the lowest molecular weight for the polyethylene oxide as 100,000 (see attached copy) in the catalog. The examiner takes the position of the Judicial Notice.

With respect to claims 13, 15, 21, 22, 24, 29 and 31 anticipated by and obvious over Martin is maintained for reason of record and above. The instant claims recite neither polyethylene oxide nor molecular weight thereof.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Tae H Yoorf

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1714

THY/May 19, 2004